

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
ARIZONA ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNERS TASK FORCE**

**May 14, 2008
1:30 p.m., MST**

The Arizona English Language Learners (ELL) Task Force met in Hearing Room 109 of the Senate Building, 1700 W. Washington Street, Phoenix, Arizona. Mr. Alan Maguire, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 1:34 p.m. MST.

1. Call to Order

Present:

Mr. Alan Maguire, Chairman

Mr. Jim DiCello

Dr. Eugene Garcia

Ms. Margaret Dugan

Ms. Johanna Haver

Ms. Eileen Klein

Ms. Anna Rosas

Absent:

Dr. John Baracy

Ms. Karen Merritt

A quorum was present for the purpose of conducting business.

2. Approval of March 13, 2008 minutes of Task Force meeting

Mr. Alan Maguire asked if there were any edits to the March 13, 2008 minutes of the ELL Task Force meeting. There were none. Mr. Jim DiCello moved to approve the minutes; the motion was seconded by Ms. Margaret Dugan. The March 13, 2008 ELL Task Force meeting minutes were unanimously approved.

3. Presentation and discussion of key criteria for review of Alternate Proposed Models

Mr. John Stollar from the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) presented the checklist of criteria that ADE uses when evaluating proposed alternative models for possible recommendation to the ELL Task Force (Attachment A). On the Alternate Model Review Sheet are seven points which are in statute. They are:

1. Four Hours of English Language Development (15-756.01 C)
2. Non Mixing of ELLs During Four Hours of ELD (15-752)
3. ELLs Grouped by Proficiency (15-752)
4. Cost Effective (15-756.01)
5. Time Element Not to Exceed One Year (15-752)
6. Clearly Stated Performance Outcomes (15-756.02 B)
7. Highly Qualified Teacher Criteria (Pursuant to requirements mandated by P.L. 107-110 No Child Left Behind legislation)

At the top of the review sheet is a statement about exceptions to the seven criteria: “Exceptions to the following criteria may be granted for alternate models where justifying factors are present: small ELL numbers, relatively successful reclassification rates, or demonstrated success on AIMS.”

Mr. Stollar met at a prior time with Dr. Eugene Garcia to review the rubric. At that time, Dr. Garcia was concerned about item #3. If this form is approved by the Task Force, then ADE can use it to review proposed alternative models so that they can make recommendations to the ELL Task Force. Superintendent Tom Horne had stated to Mr. Stollar that they need to make sure to entertain the idea that some schools may not meet the seven criteria but may have other data that indicates to ADE that they are successful. Mr. Alan Maguire asked Mr. Stollar if there is a provision within the statute that allows the Task Force to waive the statutory provisions. Mr. Stollar asked why the law would mention alternative models if there wasn't legislative recognition that there would be some creative variations from the models. He described this as straddling the law, in a way that lives by the spirit of the law while also helping schools and students. Dr. Garcia agreed that there needs to be degrees of freedom, and that the aim of the law in the end is to help students.

Ms. Margaret Dugan said that the Task Force could review data from the one-year provisional models to help them judge the success of the alternative models: Are they benefiting our ELL students? Are the ELL students becoming proficient in English at a rate that meets the one year, or two years for funding purposes? That is another piece of flexibility that the Task Force can review. She said that the Department should do their due diligence in the monitoring of alternate models and see how well these models are being applied. Are they adhering to the spirit of the law as well as some of the flexibility that the Task Force has given them based on teacher performance in the classroom, the teaching of the English language, the teaching of English, and the use of English materials? Language proficiency and academic proficiency data also need to be examined after the alternate models are in use.

Ms. Johanna Haver cautioned the Task Force that a model which shows high achievement at one district may not work at another district, particularly if it is very specific to the circumstances at that district. Mr. Stollar commented that the aim would be to find a balance; to permit too wide an open door would lose the benefit of having a rigorous model, and too narrow an open door may exclude programs which could be very successful. ADE staff members have had frequent

discussions about what models would work. If school districts are going to move away from the law, they need justification for their proposed alternative models.

Ms. Eileen Klein stated that she saw no need to move outside the law, that statute allows flexibility for the alternative models that meet the letter of the law. She expressed concern at the notion that ADE was planning to grant exceptions to the law. Mr. Stollar assured her that ADE makes recommendations only. It is for the ELL Task Force to make final decisions on all proposed alternate models. Ms. Klein stated that she thought the Department could advise the Task Force on how closely the proposed alternative model matches the law using the seven-point checklist. She recommended changing the criteria sheet language to remove the word “exceptions,” which indicates exceptions to criteria of the law. Ms. Klein is concerned about the Department sending out a statement that appears to say that a district may be given an exception to the law.

Ms. Anna Rosas asked what would constitute an acceptance of these criteria on the ADE checklist. Mr. Stollar stated that ADE staff members look for language in the proposed models matching each of the criteria items and write in notes about them. Ms. Rosas asked if it was presented as a percentage score or a checklist so that the Task Force could note which criteria items were met. Mr. Stollar stated that in most proposals the criteria items were either clearly described, or vague, and that this was noted.

Dr. Garcia asked why the Discrete Skills Inventory (DSI) was in the criteria, when it is not in the law. He stated that the use of the DSI was a Task Force decision but should not be a requirement for alternative models. He also asked if the grouping described on item #3 was in the law as he could not recall reading it in the statute. Mr. Maguire read aloud the pertinent passage from A.R.S. 15-752, English language education: “Local schools shall be permitted but not required to place in the same classroom English learners of different ages but whose degree of English proficiency is similar. Local schools shall be encouraged to mix together in the same classroom English learners from different native-language groups but with the same degree of English fluency.” Dr. Garcia recommended that the rubric directly quote the law.

Dr. Garcia noted that he has had e-mails from some districts with concerns that May and June are the months when the next year’s teaching staff and class sizes are determined, so that it is imperative that the Task Force move quickly to hear models so that schools and districts can implement them for the fall. Mr. Maguire agreed, but added that this may be difficult to rush, as the challenge in many alternate models is that one portion may fit the criteria but another may not, which leads to discussions with districts concerning how to fix the model so that it is fully compliant with statute. There must be enough structure in a model for it to be presented as a full document. Too often the documents submitted to ADE are persuasive and not descriptive in nature and do not include all of the details needed for a district to adopt and use them. The proposed alternative models must be submitted as full and complete models, and not as arguments for changes or adjustments to the existing SEI model.

Mr. Maguire agrees that the Task Force should adopt models provisionally and examine the data after a year or two to see the success rates. For example, the Task Force could look at the data from the 2008-2009 school year when it is available in Fall 2009. These provisional models would be approved only for the district or districts requesting them, and not opened up for use throughout the state as full approved models until they proved to be successful.

Dr. Garcia asked that the Task Force meet with ADE to move on some of these provisional proposed models so that districts have direction for the next school year. Mr. Maguire agreed.

4. Preliminary review of the Alternate Proposed Models received prior to March 24, 2008

First to present was San Luis Middle School. Ms. Belinda Boblett, ELL Coordinator, introduced herself and said she would be representing two proposed alternative models, one for San Luis Middle School and the other for El Pastor Elementary School, both in the Gadsden Elementary School District. Also representing San Luis Middle School were Mr. Margarito Urgana, the principal, Ms. Linda Garcia and Ms. Liz Carrasco, NCLB specialists.

Mr. Urgana stated that San Luis Middle School has 644 students; 50% of their school population are ELLs. Overall, Gadsden ESD has an ELL population of approximately 68%. Of the 50% of San Luis's population who are proficient in English, 43% are former ELL students who tested proficient. The Gadsden ESD proposed model uses five levels of proficiency. Instruction is driven by the English Proficiency Standards and the DSI. The Gadsden ESD seeks no additional funding for staff or facilities. Their staff has begun training. The focus of their program is to align English standards into all areas of instruction. They propose a two-hour block of English Language Development (ELD) and two hours of language taught through the content areas of science and social studies. ELL students would also have an hour of math, study period, and an elective.

San Luis MS staff members have researched other schools with large ELL populations, including schools in other states. They have worked to ensure that their proposed model is a research-based, successful program. Ms. Elizabeth Roscoe, NCLB specialist, continued to explain the program. She stated that in the two hours of science and social studies, content would be taught, but the standards driving the class would be the English Proficiency Standards and the DSI. In the past, there had been problems teaching these content areas to ELL students because the students lacked comprehension.

Ms. Johanna Haver asked if Pre-emergent and Emergent ELLs also would attend these classes. Ms. Roscoe stated that they would attend these classes and would be instructed at their proficiency level. Ms. Haver asked if students in the classes would be mixed proficiencies. Ms. Roscoe stated that Pre-Emergent and Emergent are grouped together in one class, while Basic, Intermediate, and Proficient levels each would be taught separately. Because of the high numbers of Intermediate ELLs, two Intermediate groups have been established.

Mr. Alan Maguire asked about the chart in their proposal and asked if the proficiency groupings stay together in the same classroom all day. Mr. Urgana said yes, the groupings are kept together. Mr. Maguire asked for clarification on the class sizes and received confirmation that the groups stay together. Ms. Roscoe stated that the grade span is seventh and eighth grade. Ms. Margaret Dugan asked if the science and social studies classes would be the reading and writing portions, using proficiency-appropriate texts and vocabulary. Mr. Urgana confirmed that this is how it would work. Ms. Dugan asked if the other two hours would include grammar and listening and speaking, and if this would be enough to prepare ELLs, in particular Pre-emergent and Emergent students, to read science and social studies books. Ms. Roscoe stated that they don't use isolated teaching, but teach the skills for social studies and science. They would bring a Pre-Emergent or Emergent student up to the skills of reading before introducing particular texts. They have woven the DSI into their science and social studies classes.

Dr. Eugene Garcia stated that it appeared San Luis's proposed model met all the criteria on the ADE rubric, and asked if they believed they were asking for any exceptions from the law. Mr. Urgana stated that they were not asking for any exceptions. Mr. Maguire asked if the teachers teaching science and social studies would be Highly Qualified to teach English. Mr. Urgana stated that they would be Highly Qualified English or Language Arts teachers for all four hours of ELD.

Ms. Boblett next introduced the proposed alternate model for Ed Pastor ES. She alerted the Task Force that they had an old model and distributed a newer version based on conversations with ADE. Their school has ten teachers and ten classrooms and no funding to expand. They have a very high ELL population, particularly from K-3 with very few non-ELLs in that grade span. In the 4th-6th grade span it swings the other way, with diminishing ELL numbers. They wish to combine the K-3 classrooms by proficiency level and use the ILLP option.

Ms. Haver asked how many non-ELLs are in kindergarten at the school. Ms. Boblett stated there were none. Ms. Dugan asked if this figure is fairly consistent from year to year or if there is high mobility. Ms. Boblett stated that the area has become more stable with most families buying homes and staying in the district. She also stated that most of the non-ELLs at the school were ELL at one time. Mr. Maguire stated that this was a great example of a very small school trying to work with the model.

The next district to make a presentation was Nogales Unified School District. Ms. Anna Rosas stated that she would not participate in questions or comments as she is from Nogales USD. Ms. Angelina Canto, School Improvement Coordinator, for Nogales USD, spoke. She stated that her district has a high ELL population: about 1600 ELLs of 2700 students in the district. About 87% are at Basic or Intermediate proficiency level. The Pre-Emergent and Emergent are mostly in Kindergarten or first grade. Four of the five elementary schools in the district participate in the Reading First program, and the fifth school has adopted the structure of the program although it is not officially a part of the program. This program provides a significant source of funding for the school district and is part of the reason for the success of their ELL program. The Reading First grouping strategies are not the same as the groupings stated in the ELL Task Force's

models. Reading First has both homogenous and heterogeneous groupings. The core instruction portion is heterogeneous and the reading component is homogenous. The conversation portion is homogenous and may cross grade levels in some cases to keep proficiency levels grouped together.

Grades 1-6 have 240 minutes of instruction in ELD, including reading. Kindergarten has 195 minutes per day ELD instruction because of a shorter school day. Entry and exit from ELL status would still be through the AZELLA. Nogales USD urgently needs a decision about this model from the Task Force, as the classrooms are organized in June for the fall. About 60% of the students are making progress, moving up at least one level of proficiency on the AZELLA. With the implementation of their proposed alternate model the district expects to improve its reclassification rates and AMAOs.

Mr. Maguire asked if it were true that under the proposed model ELLs would be mixed with non-ELLs for 165 minutes of the school day, and grouped separately for 75 minutes. Ms. Canto agreed. Mr. Maguire verified that a half hour conversational piece was being added to complete the full four hours. The heterogeneous portion of instruction uses a combination of small group and full class instruction. Students are required to participate, encouraging use of their English skills. Students are taught a core lesson and participate in student activities that test their comprehension. The students who are having difficulty are pulled out and given additional teaching. The grouping is based on understanding of the lesson, so different students may be pulled out for different topics.

Ms. Dugan asked how the Galileo assessments are used. The Galileo maps each student's performance and provides tracking of individual student skills. Galileo can identify for each student which objectives need more work, as well as identifying for the entire class which objectives may need review. Teachers have both SEI and Reading First training, and there are Reading Specialists at each school. The students with the most need are placed with teachers with the most training. Ms. Dugan asked Ms. Campo to rate the Galileo program on a scale of one to ten; Ms. Canto rated it a seven or eight. The weakness is that it is a quarterly assessment, so it cannot replace something like DIBELS which is more frequent.

Dr. Garcia asked again if this proposed alternate model is compliant with statute. Ms. Campo replied affirmatively.

Mr. Rob Dillon, Director of Pupil Personnel Services for Sierra Vista Unified School District introduced Sierra Vista's proposed alternate model. Sierra Vista has a reclassification rate of 18%, which is higher than ADE's 14% benchmark. There are 296 ELLs currently enrolled in the district of about 7000 students, or about 4%. Of those, 198 are at the elementary level. There are 20 to 57 ELLs at any particular school in the district. The school populations exceed the numbers required by the Task Force's amendment to allow ILLPs. Sierra Vista USD requests that in all of their schools ELLs receive two hours of ELD grouped by proficiency and an additional two hours of ELD instruction in their main classroom. During the two hours with the ELL teacher, one hour would be devoted to grammar including the DSI, and one hour would be

split between reading and writing. The remaining ELD instruction would take place in the general classroom by Highly Qualified, SEI trained teachers and would include conversation and additional reading and writing. ILLP would comprise the balance of instruction.

Mr. Dillon stated that they did receive funding from ADE, and will be attending the training provided by ADE on the DSI and ELD teaching strategies. They will be able to group ELLs by proficiency at the elementary grade level because they have sufficient numbers to do so. Mr. Jim DiCello asked about incremental costs. Mr. Dillon stated that there is a need for additional staff, but the need is half (the cost) of what would be needed if they were using the Task Force approved models. Sierra Vista Unified would have needed twelve teachers, but with this alternate model, the district needs only four additional teachers at the elementary level and one additional teacher at the high school level.

Dr. Garcia asked what the day would be like for a typical Pre-Emergent ELL second grader. Mr. Dillon stated that the student would receive direct instruction for two hours in an ELL ELD class for grammar, reading, and writing, and the rest of the day would be in a classroom with proficient ELLs and non-ELLs. This class would have some small group instruction as well as instruction from a teaching assistant. The general classes probably would have approximately three or four ELL students per class. Ms. Haver asked if there would be some correlation between lessons in the two hours of ELD and the rest of instruction in the general class. Mr. Dillon stated that there has to be a connection, but they have not worked out the particulars.

Mr. Maguire stated that the presentation was helpful in that he learned a great deal about the proposed model including details that were not in the written proposal. He asked that Mr. Dillon include these details in the written document, along with grouping charts to show how classrooms would look. He asked what the subject would be in the general classrooms. Mr. Dillon stated he knew it had to be English language instruction, but would try to include this in the general classroom. The district uses the SIOP model for instruction. Using SIOP procedures, students with varying skill levels could participate in general lessons.

Ms. Jeanie Favela, Assistant Superintendent for Student Services at Sunnyside Unified School District, spoke on behalf of the next proposed alternative model. With her to present were also Dr. Julia Lindberg, Dr. Edmund Dawson, and Superintendent Dr. Manuel Isquierdo. Dr. Lindberg gave a PowerPoint presentation (Attachment C) with further information about the district and the proposed model. The district has about 30% ELLs and 50% of the students speak a language other than English at home. The model uses two blocks of two hours each. The first two hour block is ELD focusing on reading, vocabulary, and grammar. The second two hours would be an applied ELD class where English would be taught through the content areas of math and science through differentiated instruction. This would be grouped across proficiencies.

Ms. Favela reiterated some of Dr. Lindberg's points and added that the district would use opportunities to enforce lessons from the ELD class to practice skills in math and science. DSI skills would be woven into content areas; for example, if the students were using past tense, teachers would create opportunities to use past tense in the math class. Ms. Favela emphasized

that reading, writing, listening, and speaking are integrated skills and should be reinforced as such.

Ms. Dugan asked how students would be grouped throughout the day. Ms. Favela stated that the two hour ELD block would be grouped by proficiency, ELLs only. The math and science classes would also be ELLs only, and then there would be a homeroom including all proficiencies. The district has a smaller number of Pre-Emergent and Emergent students compared to their higher number of students falling into the Intermediate level of ELLs, who already can speak and read but require help in academic language. Dr. Lindberg provided further information about the research basis for their model and interventions, including before and after school programs.

Dr. Lindberg introduced Dr. Dawson, who provided information on the efficacy and development of the model. Dr. Dawson stated that the formula of their proposed alternate model has four stages: formative evaluation, process evaluation, impact evaluation, and outcome evaluation. One of the primary goals is to increase level to level gains to 100% of their ELL population, increase their reclassification rate to 25%, and increase scores on the AIMS assessments. Dr. Manuel Isquierdo then discussed the progress and achievement in the district. He stated that language acquisition is not the only issue concerning ELLs in their district; the district faces funding issues, maintaining a graduation rate, and dealing with a dropout rate. Sunnyside did not receive any additional funding to implement the ELL model at their district, but Dr. Isquierdo stated that the district will implement their proposed model and show gains in level reclassification and AIMS. Their challenge is both language acquisition and academic achievement. The cost analysis of their model indicates no additional funding would be required. He asked the Task Force to give Sunnyside a year with their alternative model to show what they can do.

Ms. Haver verified that for two hours students would be grouped by proficiency, and two hours they would be in mixed proficiency groupings but all ELL. Ms. Favela agreed and added that the placement is strategic. She stated that there is a huge range in the Intermediate proficiency in particular. Class sizes were dropped from the district standard where possible, which means less than 22 for grades one and two, 24 for grades three and four, and 26 for grades five and six. In order to cover the classrooms, the district may need additional teaching staff including teaching assistants. Dr. Garcia commented that it seemed the only difference between Sunnyside's proposed model and the law was the grouping strategy and that it still followed the law by keeping ELLs grouped together. He commended the district for their consideration of not just language acquisition but achievement. Ms. Favela agreed and reiterated their belief that language must be learned in context.

Tucson Unified School District presented next, with Mr. Steve Holmes, Assistant Superintendent for Student Learning introducing the proposed alternative model through the submitted document and a PowerPoint presentation (Attachments D and E). He discussed the use of the ILLP and wanted the Task Force to understand the complications which could arise from using this for only a portion of a district. About 43 of 73 TUSD elementary schools would qualify for use of the ILLP (about 59%). About 30 TUSD elementary schools would have to use the 4 hour

model with proficiencies grouped together, 13 schools would have multiple models at their school for different grade bands, and 30 schools would exclusively use the ILLP model. Using the same analysis for secondary schools, 11 of 30 would qualify for the ILLP, 19 would use the four hour model, one would use multiple models, and 8 would exclusively use the ILLP. The district would have to monitor and create multiple curriculums for the multiple models across the district. If the whole district used the four hour model, it would not be financially prudent; they do not have the facilities or the staff in order to follow this model exclusively. The district is not receiving any additional funding for the ELL program due to their offsets. Therefore, it is fiscally impossible for the district to follow the four hour model across the district.

The problem with multiple models in the same district, particularly in schools using both models, would be that children in different grades but in the same family might have very different classroom settings and strategies; also children moving from one grade span to another could be moving from one model to another. TUSD also has high mobility within its ELL population and moving from one model to another could be problematic for students. Teacher development would also be complex because the strategies are very different between the two models. Having multiple models in a district also defeats the purpose of trying to standardize ELL programs in the state.

TUSD is asking to have a mixed model with two hours of segregated ELD instruction using the DSI, and two hours of English taught through content using ILLPs and the SIOP model in the general classroom. Mr. Holmes pointed out that there is a state mandate for all teachers to have SIOP training which is differentiated instruction, and if all teachers are required to take that training, they should be able to use it. With the ability to document this using the ILLP, they can ensure that SIOP is being used and that ELL students are receiving proper instruction. The district would hold teachers accountable to ensure that students are receiving the four hours of ELD.

Mr. Holmes presented the time allocations for the elementary program, which differ by proficiency. In the secondary school model, the Pre-Emergent and Emergent would be segregated for the full four hours of ELD instruction as per the Task Force's model. They have more flexibility for Basic and Intermediate proficiency students particularly as they near graduation. In the secondary schools the content used to teach ELD is science and math; in the elementary schools, science and math would be used as well as art, since TUSD participates in the state program "Opening Our Eyes to the Arts." The district has been using this "2 + 2" model all year and has seen evidence of its success; 90% of first grade ELL students moved up a minimum of one level in proficiency.

Ms. Rosas asked if they would be using ILLPs for all ELL students. Mr. Holmes verified that this is what the proposed alternate model calls for. Dr. Garcia asked if they would be monitoring the ELD through the ILLP. Mr. Holmes stated that they would. Mr. Holmes stated that they have an electronic format with which they are working to align with the ILLP so that students can be closely monitored. Ms. Dugan asked if the content area teachers would be okay with teaching grammar. Mr. Holmes stated that it would be science and math, and that they would

have to be. Ms. Haver commented that social studies might be easier to use as a content area to teach language skills. Mr. Holmes stated that at the high school level, math and science were easier to use with sheltered content.

White River Unified School District asked to be rescheduled for another meeting.

Mr. Rodney Rich, Assistant Superintendent for Santa Cruz Valley Unified School District presented his district's alternative model. He stated that of their 3600 students, about 85% of their students begin kindergarten as ELLs. Mr. Rich discussed the model that has existed in his district for that last four years and discussed how the model meets the law and how it has been successful. The district earned a "Performing Plus" status from AZLEARNs for their middle and high schools. The district provides extensive professional development. They use Galileo assessment and formative assessments developed by Galileo.

Mr. Rich introduced Ms. Denise Blake, Director of Instructional Support Services that includes English acquisition services. She presented a PowerPoint slide to show the Task Force that they meet those criteria required for an alternative model. The district uses the SEI model of instruction and teach all classes in English using English materials. At all levels there is a minimum of five hours of ELD instruction. They use Rosetta Stone software which they can constantly monitor, and also use quarterly benchmarks, Galileo, and AIMS data. Students are grouped together with a similar degree of fluency within a larger classroom with mixed proficiencies which includes non-ELLs. When ELLs are proficient, they are transferred to another small group within that same classroom. Even when ELLs are tested as Proficient on the AZELLA, they require continued help in reading and writing. The district has a commitment to help these students.

The proposed model is cost effective and will not require any incremental costs. The district was given \$23,000 from ADE for implementing the ELL model; most of this money will go toward teacher training. To implement the Task Force's model they would have had to hire seven new teachers at a cost of \$350,000. At kindergarten they have 85% ELLs; by high school with the latest AZELLA scores this number of ELLs drops to 10%. Part of the high school numbers is ELL students who are also special needs students.

Mr. Rich stressed that by third grade, students are up to grade level in areas such as mathematics, showing the success of their program. They are continually trying to better things. They focus a great deal on success on AIMS, which requires context and content proficiency.

Ms. Haver asked how the district's model differs from the Task Force's model. Ms. Blake stated that the main difference is the use of small group instruction within a main classroom. At the elementary level there is a three hour block of ELD and two and a half hour block of applied ELD in a content area, taught within the main homeroom. At the middle school level there are one and a half hours of ELD and 34-45 minutes of a tutorial session. The rest of the four hour required ELD is taught by content in heterogeneous settings. Ms. Haver noted that since they

start out with such a high percentage of ELLs in kindergarten, as they progress in age the non-ELLs are mostly comprised of former ELLs.

Ms. Haver asked about the Pre-Emergent student. Mr. Rich stated that the three hours of ELD are with other Pre-Emergents at the same grade level, and that the two and a half hours would be in math with ELD integrated into the lesson plan, in a mixed group setting including non-ELLs. Mr. Maguire asked if the tutorial at the middle school level would include non-ELD subjects. Ms. Blake replied that anything could be covered in the tutorial, based on benchmark testing. Mr. Maguire asked that they clarify the grouping strategies in their document, since it was not clear how students were grouped. He also requested more clarification in the document about what subjects would be taught outside the 120 minute ELD block in middle school.

5. Review, discussion and possible action of Alternate Proposed Models

Mr. Alan Maguire stated that the Task Force would hear the proposed alternative model for Glendale Union High School District, representatives from which had been in meetings with ADE and has made the suggested modifications to their model and should be now ready for a vote from the Task Force. Mr. John Stollar presented the model, stating that the Glendale UHSD model is recommended by ADE for the Task Force's approval.

Dr. Eugene Garcia asked if presenting a model is a prerequisite to being approved. Mr. Stollar said only if the Task Force made it a prerequisite. ADE would make recommendations regardless of whether the district presented to the Task Force or not.

The Glendale UHSD model states that all freshmen and sophomores receive the usual four hours of ELD. Juniors and seniors may take fewer than four hours of ELD in order to graduate on time if they are Approaching, Meeting, or Exceeding on AIMS; are on track for graduation; and have been in the ELL program for two years or more and are Intermediate proficiency. This represents 14% of the upper classes in the district.

Ms. Margaret Dugan asked if this model would be even needed in two years, since it seems to be a temporary measure to handle juniors and seniors as the new models are being implemented. Mr. Stollar stated that it probably would not be needed. Mr. Jim DiCello stated that the Task Force needs to grant two years on provisional approval because they would not have the data in time to make a decision in one year. Reclassification data comes in June, too late to tell a district to change models. AIMS data comes back in mid April. Dr. Garcia agreed that the Task Force needs to be pragmatic. Mr. Maguire stated that this would be an ongoing learning process. Mr. Stollar stated that if this model proves to be effective the Task Force could also choose to make it applicable statewide. Dr. Garcia stated that initially all models will be provisional including the Task Force's. They will all need proof of success.

Mr. Stollar stated that if they make the model available to other districts, those districts would have to notify ADE of the use of that particular model so that ADE could properly monitor them.

Ms. Eileen Klein asked if they could use the attestation form to submit to ADE which model they are using. Mr. Stollar agreed.

Mr. Maguire summarized the Glendale UHSD model, stating that students would have to meet the criteria of being juniors or seniors; score Intermediate on the AZELLA exam; be enrolled in an Arizona school two years; Approach, Meet, or Exceed on AIMS; improve on most recent AZELLA; and need certain classes to graduate on time. In that case students undertake an ILLP and are excused from the full four hours of ELD, taking instead two or three hours of ELD. Mr. Maguire stated that the Task Force model does provide for students who are proficient in one area of the AZELLA but not in others to be excused from one or two of the four hours. Glendale's model presents the same idea but with different criteria.

Dr. Garcia moved for the Task Force to provisionally approve the model; the motion was seconded by Mr. DiCello. The motion passed with a unanimous vote.

6. Presentation, discussion and possible action on an amendment of the Teacher Qualification Requirements section of the 4/10/08 Structured English Immersion ELD Model

Mr. Alan Maguire stated that ADE had worked on language to clarify the requirements for teacher requirements from the ELD approved model. Language was presented and discussed at the last Task Force meeting. This amendment is to make consistent the language in the model and current state and NCLB requirements. Mr. Jim DiCello moved to approve the new language for teacher qualification requirements section of the 4/10/08 Structured English Immersion ELD model. The motion was seconded by Ms. Margaret Dugan.

Dr. Eugene Garcia began the discussion with the comment that he had received communication from other schools, particularly middle schools where there are two levels of qualification required: the content level and now language arts in order to teach ELD. His question was whether the state has teachers available to teach these areas. He questioned if this dual requirement will pull away teachers who are content area teachers to teach English. He stated his concern that approval of this amendment would limit the number of teachers able to teach ELD and other content areas.

Ms. Jan Amator, Deputy Associate Superintendent for the Highly Qualified Professionals Unit, stated that it is State Board rule that teachers of grades 7-12 have that approved area on their certificates. This is a certification requirement, not NCLB. NCLB brought in the Highly Qualified requirement which says teachers must have 24 semester hours, or take the test, or use the rubric, so this gives a little more flexibility. With the current Task Force model there are teachers currently teaching ELD who would not be able to continue teaching English under the model. Ms. Amator stated that the clarifying language has been shared with teachers in the field who support it strongly. This language will align with current certifications requirements and will not take teachers away from content areas. For teaching the ELD four hour block, a teacher

is required to have certification in language arts. If a math or science teacher begins to teach in the ELD block, they will need language arts/reading as an approved field on their certification.

Ms. Dugan stated that just as non-ELLs are taught by Highly Qualified teachers, ELLs need Highly Qualified teachers in the areas of language in order to teach them proficiency in English. Dr. Garcia said he agreed with this, but wanted to give districts time for their staff to earn the necessary certifications and Highly Qualified status. Ms. Amator stated that teachers who are not classified as Highly Qualified must submit to the district a plan on how they will achieve that status within one year. If a teacher is, for example, a social studies teacher and has the credentials to teach ELD, the school must take the financial responsibility to get that teacher Highly Qualified to teach that area. The basic certification teachers need to teach is state law and not just the model.

The motion was put to a vote. Dr. Garcia voted against; the rest of the Task Force voted in favor, and the motion was passed with a vote of six for, one against.

7. Presentation and Discussion of Training Program for School District Personnel on Structured English Immersion Models

Mr. John Stollar stated that training was going well. Dr. Eugene Garcia asked who pays for the training. Mr. Stollar stated that the State pays for the training as part of the incremental costs submitted by school districts for the budget request. Mr. Jim DiCello stated that ADE has said it has the staff to do the training, so there would be no cost to districts in attending the training; the only costs incurred are travel expenses and any needs for substitute teachers. Mr. Stollar stated that ADE has partnered with some districts to continue training and that if the district receives money in the budget after offsets then that money pays for incremental costs of training all their teachers for the full seven days. Dr. Garcia noted that if a district has offsets then they do not receive funding and are required to pay for it since this is a mandate from the state. Mr. Stollar stated that he did not see it that way. The training is simply provided by ADE and they also provide people to train people at the districts. ADE is providing the first three days which are needed in order to implement the model, and in the fall will continue with four additional days of training.

8. Presentation and Discussion of Upcoming Task Force Activities

The next scheduled Task Force meeting is on June 12. Mr. Alan Maguire stated that he was looking at two other dates before that for the Task Force to meet and discuss proposed alternative models. The proposed dates are May 21 and June 5. He will communicate with the Task Force if either of those dates work.

Ms. Eileen Klein noted that there had been several proposed alternate models with a "2 +2" format in the four hours of ELD. She asked if ADE could provide a spreadsheet to show cross

district characteristics in proposed models that the Task Force could use as a visual guide to distinguish the different models. Mr. Stollar stated that ADE could create something the Task Force can use.

9. Call to the Public

A call to the public was made at 5:13 p.m. One sheet was turned in, but the speaker had already left. The statement was in Spanish and not read aloud by the Task Force.

10. Discussion of future meeting dates

The next ELL Task Force meeting will take place on June 12. There may be an additional meeting on either May 21 or June 5.

11. Adjournment

Mr. Jim DiCello moved to adjourn the meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Margaret Dugan. The meeting adjourned at 5:14 p.m.

Arizona ELL Task Force

Alan Maguire, Chairman